

It seems clear to me that a corporate broadcaster like Sinclair is not simply expressing its First Amendment rights in forcing its stations to air an extended anti-Kerry advertisement disguised as a documentary. If they do air such propaganda, their license, which is granted by the American people, should be revoked, and a requisite fine should be levied. How could Chairman Powell claim that regulation needs to be relaxed? It needs to be tightened--the airwaves do not belong to Sinclair or Powell, but to the people.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned

postcard. Thank you.